

**CITY OF NORWALK PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Revised 10/14/05  
CITY OF NORWALK  
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
AUGUST 24, 2005

ATTENDANCE: Doug Sutton, Chairman; Matthew Miklave; Rick McQuaid; Fred Bondi, Betsy Bain; Leona Williams

STAFF: Sara LeTourneau, Director of Personnel & Labor Relations;  
John Schlosser; Deputy Corporation Counsel M. Jeffrey Spahr

OTHERS: Mr. Peter Wein; Mr. Bill Krummel; Ms. Barbara Amodio

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 p.m. by the Chairman.

\*\* MR. SUTTON MOVED TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO HEAR AGENDA ITEM #5.

\*\* MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 20, 2005 MEETING MINUTES

\*\* MR. BONDI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 20, 2005 MEETING AS DISTRIBUTED.

\*\* THE MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR (SUTTON, BAIN, MIKLAVE, BONDI) AND TWO ABSTENTIONS (MCQUAID, WILLIAMS).

DISCUSSION:

A) APPROVAL OF SALARIES FOR ORDINANCE LIST (REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE) EXECUTIVE SESSION

\*\* MR. MIKLAVE MOVED THE APPROVAL OF SALARIES FOR THE ORDINANCE LIST.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. DISCUSSION OF ORDINANCE LIST PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

The Committee did not go into Executive Session.

The Chairman asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Bondi stated that he felt they should separate the names on the ordinance list and vote on each one separately.

**\*\* MR. BONDI MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO SEPARATE THE NAMES ON THE ORDINANCE LIST OF SALARY INCREASES.**

Ms. Bain asked for the rationale of the amendment. Mr. Bondi responded that he had not seen up-to-date appraisals and goals and he felt that some people on the list should not receive a raise.

The Chairman asked if the evaluations were accessible. Ms. LeTourneau stated that two months ago the Committee asked for the evaluations and they were accessible and she also had them available at the last meeting. She stated that she also had them with her this evening. Mr. Bondi stated that he did not receive them and that he asked for them at the last meeting.

Attorney Spahr stated that if a request was made to review a personnel file, the procedure was that a notation had to be made as to who was seeing it. He also reviewed the rules for Executive Session. He stated that the Committee did not have to go into Executive Session to discuss generalities about the ordinance list, however if the Committee was to discuss performance evaluations, they would have to make a Motion to go into Executive Session and it would have to be passed by 2/3 of the Committee and stated on the record the reason that the Executive Session was called. He continued that the Freedom of Information Act says that an individual who is going to be discussed had the right to demand it be held in public session and had the right to stop it from going into Executive Session. He continued that if an individual on the ordinance list was not present at the meeting and was given notice of the topic, by not being present they waived their right.

Mr. McQuaid asked if all individuals on the list received notification of this meeting. Ms. LeTourneau stated that all individuals on the ordinance list were sent emails to their City addresses of the notice of the meeting. Attorney Spahr read the email sent on August 18th to all individuals on the ordinance list.

Ms. Bain stated that she received a telephone call this evening that one individual on the ordinance list was ill and could not be present, but requested that the approval not take place until they were able to be present. Attorney Spahr asked Ms. LeTourneau if anyone had responded to her that they would not be attending the meeting. She replied that no one had responded to her. Ms. Bain stated that she felt the person to be discussed should be present. Attorney Spahr stated that the Committee did not have to go into Executive Session to discuss an individual.

Mr. Peter Wein asked if the Committee had the evaluations in front of them to make a decision. The Chairman stated that they had access to them but they were not all complete packages. Mr. Miklave stated that it would be appropriate to discuss individuals as part of the package. Mr. Bondi stated that his reason for separating the names would be to discuss them in this body and then send it on to Common Council.

Mr. Wein asked Mr. Miklave if he had access to the records and read them and Mr. Miklave stated that he had not looked at them nor intended to. Mr. Wein stated that it was difficult to discuss an individual if they had not read their personnel file.

The Chairman stated that the process being used was not based entirely on salary and it took two years to put it in place. He continued that it was a goal-oriented process to get everyone on the same page. He added that last year was a phase-in section that covered one-half of the year and this was the first full year of implementing the process. He stated that it seemed like it had been in place a long time but had not. He explained that once they see the direction, adjustments will be made according to the reality of the process.

Mr. Bondi asked Ms. LeTourneau when the evaluations were done. She responded that she had the evaluations completed at the close of the fiscal year and that the Mayor had not done his evaluations since January. Mr. Bondi asked if everyone had their goals set. Ms. LeTourneau replied that she has not received goal setting forms from the Mayor. Mr. Bondi asked how could they make a judgment if they did not have a complete set available.

Mr. Bill Krummel stated that they should tie compensation to evaluation and what they were doing now was taking a lot of time and not producing anything. He stated that he thought it was appropriate to let the Mayor move ahead because it was time to move on. Ms. Bain stated that she had a problem with rewarding people above and beyond exceptional service based on salary. She stated that it should come in some manner, but not salary. She suggested that the Committee look into a bonus pool where it was not tied to salary. She continued that there had to be a more objective way of evaluating total performance because there were different perspectives held. She stated that she would not be supporting separating the list this year. Mr. McQuaid asked if there were any other departments with incomplete evaluations. Ms. LeTourneau responded that all goal setting forms were in from everyone but the Mayor.

Mr. Miklave stated that it was a confusing process and when it was developed it tried to be based on fundamental fairness. He stated that the final evaluation should be based on the goals set in the beginning of the performance year and the evaluation done by the supervisor. He believed that it was important that evaluations and compensation be based on fairness, however when they are in a public body, there was a tendency to let other factors enter into the process and they have to be careful. He continued that by deviating from the appropriate supervisors evaluating the employees invites inconsideration that they should try to prevent. He stated he believed the supervisor and the Mayor should be accountable for the people that report to them. He stated that he found the 3.5% cost of living increase recommended by the Mayor appropriate and it was separate from the performance evaluation. Mr. Miklave stated that he did not support separating the list.

Mr. Joe Robidoux stated that he was a taxpayer and was disappointed in the whole process. He stated that they had one-half of the information and how could they evaluate people. His concern was not the amount but how it was evaluated so that he felt comfortable as a taxpayer.

Mr. Bondi stated that he felt he represented the people and he felt that the people in the administration were not doing a good job. He continued that they were six months behind in some departments and the process was not being followed.

Ms. Barbara Amodio stated that as a taxpayer she reiterated what she said at the last meeting. She stated that she was glad Mr. Bondi represented the taxpayers but they need an oversight and audit committee to look at the credentials with expertise and impartiality. She also stated that the City of Norwalk did not have a action plan for Affirmative Action and there was an enormous loss of good people in the minority groups.

#### ACTIONS ON ITEM 2

The Chairman asked for a vote to the Amendment of the Motion to separate the ordinance list.

**\*\* THE MOTION TO SEPARATE THE ORDINANCE LIST WAS DEFEATED WITH THREE IN FAVOR (BONDI, MCQUAID, WILLIAMS) AND THREE OPPOSED (SUTTON, BAIN, MIKLAVE).**

**\*\* MR. SUTTON MOVED TO FORWARD THE ORDINANCE LIST OF SALARY INCREASES TO COMMON COUNCIL.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR IN FAVOR (MIKLAVE, BAIN, WILLIAMS, SUTTON); ONE OPPOSED (BONDI) AND ONE ABSENTION (MCQUAID).**

#### NEXT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING

The next Personnel Committee will be on September 28, 2005, at 8:00 p.m.

**\*\* MR. MCQUAID MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna DeVito  
Telesco Secretarial Services